



University of Chester



**This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester's
online research repository**

<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>

Author(s): Elaine L Graham

Title: Jews, Pagans, sceptics and emperors

Date: 25 February 2014

Originally given at: Chester Theological Society meeting

Example citation: Graham, E. L. (2014, February 25). *Jews, Pagans, sceptics and emperors*. Unpublished presentation given at Chester Theological Society meeting, 25 February 2014.

Version of item: Given at meeting

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/313501>

Jews, Pagans, Sceptics and Emperors: Public Theology in a Post-Secular Age

Chester Theological Society, February 25th 2014

Elaine Graham

Introduction

This lecture begins with sociological theories of secularization and the ‘post-secular’, and proceeds, via public theology, to Christian apologetics.

My topic is prompted by some emerging social and cultural trends in the West which suggest that religion, far from becoming marginal to society (as was once predicted), is returning to public prominence as a significant factor in global politics and civil society. Tony Blair’s recent comment (Blair, 2014) that ‘religious extremism’ will be a major source of global conflict throughout this century may be a little simplistic (ignoring as it does other factors such as competition for natural resources, migration, climate change and economic polarization), but it does go to show that faith is not dead. This is particularly evident in areas of government policy here in the UK, which highlights the renewed currency of religious belief and practice, particularly around its potentially beneficial contribution to welfare reform, well-being and community cohesion.

But whilst this new visibility of religion casts doubt on many of the predictions of classic secularization theory – that religion is in inevitable decline - I don’t subscribe to the view that we are experiencing anything like a religious revival. This is due to the enduring influence of a completely different social and cultural trajectory: of secularism and religious scepticism. Critics of religion, such as the likes of Richard Dawkins, Polly Toynbee, Sam Harris and the late

Christopher Hitchens, argue that religion has no place in public life. Religious belief may inform a person's individual values and motivations, according to the protocols of liberal democracy, there has to be a kind of 'firewall' between personal faith and public policy. Partly as a legacy of the European religious wars of the C16th and C17th, partly due to the influence of the Enlightenment, religion is regarded as an illegitimate and divisive basis on which to build a truly open and civilized society.

Hence the title of the book on which this lecture is based. We find ourselves between a 'rock' of religious resurgence – or at least renewed visibility – and the 'hard place' of secularism. And it's the paradoxical, often uncomfortable space in between these two contradictory trajectories that is of interest to me. How do we handle the unprecedented co-existence of these two discourses? And in particular, how do people of faith give an account of their motivations and values in a world that is more sensitive than ever to religious belief and practice, yet often struggles to accommodate it into secular discourse.

I also want to ask whether the resources of public theology can help the churches and ordinary Christians to address this unprecedented context. Can Christians articulate their core principles in terms that are accessible to pluralist, secular society whilst remaining authentic to the resources of Scripture and tradition? I intend to answer this by calling for a renewal of the practice of Christian *apologetics*: the task of offering a reasoned defence or rationale for one's faith. The early Christian epistle, the first letter of Peter, summarises this imperative as follows: *Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have.* (1 Peter 3.15, NIV).

Whilst apologetics has often been perceived in terms of asserting propositional truths such as the existence of God, or the historicity of the miracles, I want to rehabilitate a tradition which dates from the earliest years of Christianity, whereby the apologists were effectively public theologians. Their ‘apologies’ were about the grounds for belief, certainly, but they were also about making a case to the political authorities for the right of Christians to pursue their vocation as citizens. In contemporary terms, a public theology that ‘gives an account of the hope that is within you’ is something that demonstrates convincingly, as much through actions as words, that faith can make a positive contribution. But in keeping with the convictions of public theology, this is a demonstration of faith that is prepared to ‘speak truth to power’. As such, it should prioritize the well-being of society over the survival of the Church. In other words, the proponents of public theology – ranging from Church authorities, public intellectuals to local activists and campaigners – should contribute critically and constructively to public debate, but have to be more attentive than ever to the tasks of justifying and articulating the theological well-springs of these commitments in ways that are accessible and comprehensible to a fragmented and sceptical body politic.

Resurgence and Decline

How are we to make sense of the fortunes of religion in today’s society? It’s a complex and somewhat contradictory state of affairs. The conventional account of secularization sees religious decline – even extinction – as an inevitable consequence of modernization. Yet evidence suggests that this is not the case.

On the one hand, religion is strikingly visible in public life – whether we are thinking locally, nationally, or globally. In many of the most rapidly-developing economies, such as Brazil, China, or India, religion continues to grow and to be a significant part of public life.

In the UK, last week, church leaders took to the pages of the tabloid press to challenge aspects of the Coalition's administration of welfare benefits. Faith-based charities are at the forefront of day-to-day provision, such as food banks and debt counselling - but of course, continue to be significantly engaged in education, housing, care of the elderly, child support and so on.

On the other hand, there is little reason, certainly for those of us in this particular part of northern Europe, to feel quite so sanguine about the resilience of religion or its future prospects. Levels of formal institutional affiliation and membership in mainstream Christian and Jewish denominations continue to diminish across the Western world. Religious observance is increasingly disaffiliated and individualized; religious institutions are viewed with indifference at best, distrust at worst.

The paradoxical state of religion is clear when we look at recent statistical evidence. The decline of organised and institutional religion is well-documented in contemporary British society. According to the 2011 Census, 59% of people (or just over 33 million) in England and Wales consider themselves as Christian, a decline of 12% on the previous census. Those recording 'no religion' grew from 15 per cent in 2001 to 25 per cent in 2011 – that's around 14 million people.

Yet, for all that formalised religious belief and institutionalised religious belonging has declined over recent decades, this is not a picture of universal secularization. Far from it: there is a strong, albeit highly eclectic, spiritual current running through the nation. For example, in a survey by ComRes last year on behalf of Theos, the religious think tank, over three-quarters of all adults (77%) and nearly two-thirds (61%) of non-religious people said they believed that "there

are things in life that we simply cannot explain through science or any other means.” (ComRes, 2013)

Whilst many people classify themselves as ‘Nones’ (no religion), they are just as likely to insist that they are ‘spiritual’. According to Robert Fuller, as many as 33 per cent of people in US identify as ‘Spiritual but not Religious’ (Fuller 2001). Some statistical evidence suggests a high correlation between age and religiosity, with younger people less likely to identify themselves with an organized religion. A Pew Research Center survey in the US in 2010 recorded 25 per cent of adults born after 1980 (so-called ‘Generation Y’, or under 30s) as unaffiliated, describing their religion as "atheist," "agnostic" or "nothing in particular." This compares with less than one-fifth of people in their 30s (Generation X, at 19 per cent), 15 per cent of those in their 40s, 14 per cent of those in their 50s and 10 per cent or less among those 60 and older (Pew Forum 2010). The differences appear to be a feature of this particular generation, rather than explained by people becoming more religious as they grow older: so the under-30s were significantly more unaffiliated than members of Generation X were at a comparable point in their life cycle (20 per cent in the late 1990s) and twice as unaffiliated as Baby Boomers (born between 1945 and 1960) were as young adults (13 per cent in the late 1970s). Might we also designate Generation Y as ‘Generation SBNR’ with all that this may mean for the public fortunes of organized religion in the future?

But even if the UK is not (yet) a nation of atheists, we might say that it is certainly one of sceptics. There probably always has been this deep vein of heterodoxy lurking below the formalities of creedal, institutional faith; but maybe what has changed is that people now have a more ready vocabulary of being ‘spiritual but not religious’; of saying that it is acceptable to have a personalised clutch of beliefs; that people are freer to sample and experiment between a range of

religious paths (or are they products?). The disaffiliation has taken place at the level of engagement with institutionalised expressions of religious dogma rather than away from practices such as prayer, astrology, meditation or a belief in the existence of ‘a higher spiritual being that can be called God’ (ComRes, 2013, p. 7).

So at the level of personal belief and affiliation, we see an undeniable trend of numerical decline, but not matched by any outstanding growth of secularism within the population at large – or at least no clear patterns beyond increasing pluralism and diversity of beliefs and attitudes. And that similar combination of cultural persistence and institutional decline is also affecting the fortunes of religion within broader public life, such as social policy, economics, culture and media.

The sociologist Linda Woodhead has done a great deal of work to excavate the many layers of this situation, and this quotation from 2012 reflects the complexity of it all quite well:

Britain now finds itself in a situation in which old and new forms of commitment, power and organization co-exist and compete with one another ... why Britain can be religious and secular; ... why the majority of the population call themselves Christian but are hostile or indifferent to many aspects of religion; why governments embrace ‘faith’ but are suspicious of ‘religion’; why public debate swings between ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘integration’; why religion is viewed as both radical and conservative; why we build multi-faith spaces ... but can no longer speak of God in public. (Woodhead, 2012, p. 26)

Crossing the Secular Rubicon

It's a perfect storm, in many respects, therefore. Religious institutions are fragile; sceptics and critics of religion continue to question its very legitimacy as a respectable intellectual option and a legitimate influence in society; and yet, religion continues to be a significant source of social capital, and comprises the strongest single stake-holder in the voluntary sector. It is a remarkably potent mobilising force for volunteers; and globally, if not the 'cause' of political and cultural change, cannot be disentangled from issues of identity, popular movements, nation-building, geo-political conflict or humanitarian initiatives.

In many ways, then, the kind of religious faith that is emerging at the beginning of the twenty-first century, and which dominates the public imagination, is very different from what went before. It represents much less of a religious revival and much more a quest for a new presence in the midst of public life that is more fragmented, more global, more disparate. It is a context in which the contribution of religion to the well-being of communities is welcomed by some, with new agendas and increasing enthusiasm; but at the same time, the very legitimacy of faith to speak or contribute at all is contested as vigorously as ever.

This takes us into uncharted territory, sociologically and theologically, and is generating a concept amongst a number of writers – across the fields of sociology, political theory, philosophy and theology – known as the 'post-secular' (Habermas, *Notes on a Post-Secular Society*, 2008) (Bretherton, 2010, pp. 10-16) (Gorski, et al., eds. 2012).

Now, this idea could probably generate several lectures in its own right, so I want to indicate some of the contours of the debate before returning to the specific, rather agonistic, sense in which I am deploying the term.

It certainly starts with the deficiencies of the secularization thesis, and the unexpected ‘re-enchantment’ of global politics – something we can probably date from the Iranian revolution in 1979, the rise of the Moral Majority in the US in the 1980s, the emergence of Islamist movements in the Middle East, Africa and South Asia; clearly, the destruction of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 stands as an iconic and devastating moment in all this, as an explicitly-religiously motivated intervention in world affairs.

Alongside the political analysts, we also have cultural theorists and philosophers weighing up the impact of this ‘resacralisation’ of world affairs and public speech. The German social theorist Jürgen Habermas has been extremely influential here. In his earlier years, he would have allied himself with a broadly liberal position which required the separation of religion from the state and the creation of a non-confessional public space in order to ensure the most equitable conditions for the articulation of a rich and non-partisan discourse of citizenship and participatory democracy. Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, he has been more prepared to consider the introduction of religious sources of reasoning into a renewed vocabulary of civic virtue. He has alluded to a kind of melancholy in late modernity, a sense of lack within secular reason – as he says, ‘an awareness of what is missing’ (2010), namely any sort of metaphysical or transcendental grounding of its commitment to things such as justice, progress and well-being. This is prompted in part by a response to the global financial crisis of 2007-8, which he felt exposed the lack of any values of public accountability on the part of the global economy; and

concerns about the impact of advanced biotechnologies on our understandings of human integrity and dignity.

So religion may help to correct some of the pathologies of modernity (Dillon, 2010, pp. 143-144). It offers a clear narrative of human dignity and value; whilst post-Enlightenment philosophers have tended to focus on the divisive and regressive influence of religion on society, Habermas is now more prepared to identify its potential as a powerfully cohesive and beneficial source of moral and political reasoning. In 2010, in the collection of essays entitled *An Awareness of What is Missing*, he concluded this:

‘Among the modern societies, only those that are able to introduce into the secular domain the essential contents of their religious traditions which point beyond the merely human realm will also be able to rescue the substance of the human.’ (Habermas, *An Awareness of what is Missing*, 2010, p. 5)

Also relevant is Charles Taylor’s comprehensive (running to over 800 pages) and nuanced account of secularization and its contemporary connotations, *A Secular Age* (2007). Taylor argues that the secular sensibility is not one we can easily disinvent or transcend. As I’ve already said, according to conventional sociological definitions, secularization denotes the separation of religion and politics, the disenchantment of our intellectual and political life in the face of technological advancement and the spread of rational-technical modes of reasoning. But even if religion is now returning to the public square as a mobilising force for civil society, even if people continue to be attracted to a range of spiritual and supernatural phenomena, there is a way in which Western culture has already experienced an irretrievable loss of innocence. It is post—

secular, because there has been an irrevocable shift in what Taylor terms ‘the conditions of belief ... which takes us from a society in which it was virtually impossible not to believe in God, to one in which faith, even for the staunchest believer, is one human possibility among others’ (Taylor, 2007, p. 3). No kind of re-emergent faith will ever ‘unmake’ modernity’s understandings of the ‘buffered self’ who lives unfettered by the constraints of religious dogma, and science’s model of the cosmos as autonomous of divine agency. We might say that after modernity, we have crossed a secular Rubicon, and we cannot *not* view this surprising after-life of religion from any other vantage-point.

Taylor’s sense of the post-secular is as something unprecedented yet decisive, then: ‘different and unrecognizable to any earlier epoch ... marked by an unheard of pluralism of outlooks, religious and non- and anti-religious ...’ He continues, ‘Thus my own view of secularization ... is that there has certainly been a “decline” of religion ... But the interesting story is not simply one of decline, but also of a new placement of the sacred or spiritual in relation to individual and social life. This new placement is now the occasion for recompositions of spiritual life in new forms, and for new ways of existing both in and out of relation to God.’ (Taylor, 2007, p. 437)

So this is the context into which bodies such as the Christian churches are speaking. We have the signs of decline, of slow but steady marginalisation, and yet there are contrary trends which suggest that it is not simply about accommodating to the inevitabilities of secularization. If the churches are committed to any kind of significant public role, then the nature of public theological discourse must change. No longer is it speaking into a common frame of reference, in which their Biblical or moral allusions fall comfortably on waiting ears. Rather, in a context where people’s familiarity with any kind of organized religion is ever more tenuous, churches and theologians will need to find a new language by which they justify the legitimacy of religion within public

life. Christians will need to renew their energies to do their theology *in public*, with a view to defending and justifying the role of religion across that post-secular divide.

Challenges for Public Theology

Public theology takes place in a variety of contexts and has a range of practitioners. Broadly, it seeks to comment and critically reflect from a theological perspective, referring to the ways in which religion interacts with questions of economics, media, politics, law, globalization, social justice and environment. Public theology sees itself as rooted in religious traditions, but strongly in conversation with secular discourse and public institutions.

In our short book on urban theology, Stephen Lowe and I identified three main genres: ‘the type of public theology that engages with issues of public policy from a faith-based perspective’, such as church reports or public statements; ‘the processes of guidance or formation that equip Christians ... to exercise faithful witness in relation to the secular world’: directed more, perhaps, to an internal audience of church members who wish to reflect theologically on matters of public issues; and the ‘study of how a faith-commitment might [in]form the public conduct of politicians’ and other public figures: in other words, how private conviction transforms into public policy (Graham and Lowe, 2009, pp. 4-5).

Public theology concerns itself with three main streams of public life:

- The market: Economics, globalization, finance
- Civil society, culture, media, ecology, science, public health, technology and the media, grass-roots organizing, education

- State, government, political power and regulation of public life

Traditionally, public theology has drawn predominantly from mainstream Protestant and Reformed Christian theologies, reflecting its initial strengths in North America and the UK (Stackhouse M. , *God and Globalization, Volume 4: Globalization and Grace*, 2007) (Storror and Morton, 2004). Even here, however, the respective position of the Christian churches, reflecting a constitutional separation of Church and State in the US and the Established or state status of churches in England, Germany, Scotland and Scandinavia, have given rise to a diversity of approaches in relation to the institutional and cultural role of mainstream Christianity in relation to public discourse and liberal democracy. Theologies of liberation have also featured strongly, especially from South Africa, where the prominent role of the churches in the anti-apartheid struggle engendered a wealth of theological reflection on the nature of justice, resistance and reconciliation (de Gruchy, 2007).

Conventionally, the notion of ‘public’ has encompassed two meanings for public theologians: firstly, a concern for the corporate, political and societal meanings of faith, in contrast to forms of religious belief and practice that confine faith to private and pietist intentions (Hainsworth and Paeth, 2010); thus, public theology refers to the ways in which religion interacts with questions of economics, media, politics, law, globalization, social justice and environment. Secondly, it reflects a commitment on the part of public theologians to conduct debates about the public trajectories of faith and practice in ways that are transparent and publicly accessible and defensible (Breitenberg, 2003). Public theology is less concerned with defending the interests of specific faith-communities, than generating informed understandings of the theological and religious dimensions of public issues and developing analysis and critique in language that is accessible across disciplines and faith-traditions.

Public theology may have interpretative, critical and constructive dimensions. Some work examines actual examples of interventions into public debate or political procedures by churches or other faith-based organizations, often using empirical and sociological, as well as theological and hermeneutical tools. Other contributions undertake a critique of the ways in which theological language, concepts and values are mediated into public debate, e.g. common good, salvation, covenant, Trinity. Occasionally, public theologians contribute to the normative and formative reconstruction of communities of faith as they seek to exercise a public ministry in relation to questions of ecology, global finance, poverty or urban life and faith. Increasingly, a perspective of virtue ethics is informing the work of public theologians (thus linking with perspectives in pedagogy and practical theology) by which ordinary persons of faith may be equipped theologically to read ‘the signs of the times’ and apprehend a larger set of meanings amidst economic, cultural, political and global trends.

It’s this commitment to engagement with non-theological sources and resources that has been one of the characteristic commitments of public theology, and gives rise to the suggestion it has an important ‘apologetic’ dimension. Max Stackhouse, formerly of Princeton Theological Seminary offers one of the most profound explorations of this. He affirms a number of basic principles about the nature of public theology (Stackhouse M. , *Public Theology and Ethical Judgement*, 2006).

Firstly, religion is never simply a matter of personal or private devotion, but carries over into the believer’s life in all aspects of the public domain, such as economics, civil society, the State and culture.

Secondly, if ‘public’ for Stackhouse is anathema to notions of a spiritualised, privatised faith for the individual, the corollary is an emphasis on the public significance of religion’s impact:

‘... theology, while related to intensely personal commitments and to a particular community of worship, is, at its most profound level, neither merely private nor a matter of distinctive communal identity. Rather, it is an argument regarding the way things are and ought to be, one decisive for public discourse and necessary to the guidance of individual souls, societies, and, indeed, the community of nations.’ (Stackhouse M. , Public Theology and Ethical Judgement, 2006, p. 165)

Thirdly, Stackhouse insists that theology must be a fully public, ‘bilingual’ discourse, in terms of being prepared to defend its core principles *in public*:

‘if a theology is to be trusted to participate in public discourse it ought to be able to make a plausible case for what it advocates in terms that can be comprehended by those who are not believers ... It should be able to articulate its core convictions in comprehensible terms across many modes of discourse, explaining its symbolic and mythical terms ... in ways that expose their multiple levels of meaning.’ (Stackhouse M. , God and Globalization, Volume 4: Globalization and Grace, 2007, p. 112)

Such a commitment to a dialogical, transparent mode of theological reasoning does not go unchallenged. Post-liberal theology, associated with writers such as George Lindbeck, George Stroup, Hans Frei and Stanley Hauerwas, and those associated with ‘Radical Orthodoxy’ – John Milbank, Graham Ward, Catherine Pickstock, Daniel Bell and Phillip Blond – are all dismissive

of attempts to engage in constructive apologetics in a pluralist public realm. Such perspectives lament what they regard as the capitulation of contemporary theology (especially its liberal tendencies) to modernity, and seek to exercise alternative forms of Christian witness that will restore the cultural and theo-political primacy of Christendom. Hence, the public speaking of a theologian is sanctioned by its faithfulness to a distinctive ecclesial ethic, rather than a quest for public coherence or relevance. It seeks to defend the integrity and particularity of theology against a liberal apologetic strategy that seemed to privilege its credibility in the eyes of Christianity's 'cultured despisers' over its obedience to traditional Christian orthodoxy. As George Stroup once observed, 'Post-liberals are bound to be sceptical ... about apologetics.' (Stroup, 1984, p. 129)

At the heart of this disagreement lies the question of the extent to which public theology can be bilingual and remain authentically or distinctively rooted in tradition. Those who would identify with the discipline of public theology have long been exercised by the question of how theology 'goes public', and how to balance the demands of pluralism and resistance to religious speech in public with the imperatives of speaking convincingly and coherently from a position of faith. In defence of the dialogical stance, if apologetics is defined as 'any publicly intelligible attempt to redeem the theoretical credibility of Christian belief' (Kamitsuka, 1999, p. 46), then this surely commits the theologian to endeavour to communicate in ways which rest on an assumption of accountability to the non-theological: to convince, to commend, and to construct a publicly-accessible discourse by which theology can defend its values to those beyond its own speech-community. The public theologian necessarily stands at the threshold of church and world, of sacred and secular. This in turn rests on a doctrines of creation, the nature of revelation and common grace, and of the possibility of a shared space by virtue of our common humanity in which rational communication about the ends, aims and substance of public life can be conducted.

Max Stackhouse's work has been described as 'tradition-based apologetic public theology' (Hogue, 2010, p. 362). He is concerned to offer a theologically and ethically informed commentary on public issues and the future of global civil society, but also to help the Christian community think through the theological basis for its engagement with that very same public sphere and the practices of citizenship at local, national and global levels. The task of public theology is to enable people (of any faith or none) 'to discern how and where *in the world*, the traces of God's truth and justice may be unveiled' (Stackhouse M. L., 2014, p. 293).

Stackhouse therefore regards the task of public theology as one of apologetics, insofar as (especially in a religiously pluralist, global context) it is expedient to articulate (and be prepared to defend) the values that inform Christian statements about, and interventions in, the public realm. It reflects a commitment on the part of public theologians to conduct debates about the public trajectories of faith and practice in ways that are transparent and publicly accessible and defensible (Breitenberg, 2003). Public theology is less concerned with defending the interests of specific faith-communities than generating informed understandings of the moral and religious dimensions of public issues and developing analysis and critique in language that is accessible across disciplines and faith-traditions.

'From very early on one of the meanings of apologetics was that you enter into another person's vocabulary and worldview as best you can, and the very fact that we can do that in some measure suggests that there is some deep contact between humans. Some profound creational theology is behind that: we are all children of God, whether everyone acknowledges it or not, and we can enter into one another's vocabulary and begin to articulate the most profound things that we think are really true.' (Chase, 2001)

My concern, then, is to consider whether the discipline of public theology can articulate new norms for Christians who are concerned to engage constructively with public debate and political policy, but are aware of the growing gulf between the discourse of faith (after all, that Enlightenment convention dictates ‘we don’t do God’ in public) yet who still want to communicate the basis of their faith and the roots of their concern for the common good convincingly and reasonably to the world at large. The voices of public theology are still relevant to public debate on specific issues or policies, but they have to cultivate a clearer rationale for their very right to speak at all. Public theologians face the challenge not only of articulating theologically grounded interventions in the public square, but of justifying and defending the very relevance of the Christian faith in a culture that no longer grants automatic access or credence.

A New Apologetics

Whilst many people would concede that Christian faith comprises more than intellectual assent to theological propositions (Beilby, 2011, pp. 168-169), most of the contemporary literature tends to adopt arguments based on the rational, empirical plausibility of Christian doctrine with a view to bringing about personal conversion. Avery Dulles goes so far as to describe the apologist as one who ‘is regarded as an aggressive, opportunistic person who tries, by fair means or foul, to argue people into joining the church’ (Dulles 1971, p. xix). I’m not convinced, then, that this adequately addresses the challenge of defending and commending the role of Christianity in relation to public issues of policy and practice. Yet nor do I believe that this picture is consistent with evidence from the history of Christianity.

As Christian communities became established and dispersed around the Graeco-Roman world, so the challenges of interpreting and commending the faith to Jewish and pagan cultures became more pressing. Acts of the Apostles records how on the day of Pentecost, Peter's sermon is addressed predominantly to a Jewish audience, and proclaims the significance of Jesus as Messiah, prophet of Israel and fulfilment of the Hebrew Scriptures (Acts 2:14-36). Acts 17 relates Paul's journey to Thessalonica, where he preached in a synagogue, reasoning from the Jewish Scriptures and prophets. Despite not encountering any prior hostility, this is sufficient nevertheless to provoke a backlash (Acts 17:1-9). Later, in Athens, Paul visits the synagogue, but concentrates on debating with pagan philosophers at the Areopagus, where he preaches the Gospel as the fulfilment of extant hidden wisdom (Acts 17:16-34). Similarly, in Acts 24: 10-21, whilst in Caesarea, Paul has to defend himself against the charges brought against him by the orator Tertullus (Acts 24:1-8), who accuses him of causing breaches of the peace through his preaching. Paul's response follows the patterns of Roman legal convention, appealing not only to Jewish tradition and the Scriptures but to Roman rules of evidence.

In his *History of Apologetics* first published in 1971, Avery Dulles groups Christian apologetics into three main genres, depending on the context and intended audience. 'Religious apologies' argued for the superiority of the gospel over other religious or philosophical systems; 'internal apologies' were concerned to correct error or heresy within the Christian community itself; but a third group, which Dulles terms 'political apologies' developed their arguments in order to secure civil toleration of Christianity in the face of state persecution (Dulles, 1999, p. 28).

Avery Dulles also describes apologetics as 'the attempt to defend a particular belief or system of beliefs against objections' (Dulles, 1999). Philosophical, propositional, perhaps, but an *apologia* was also the summary speech for the defence in a court of law. In the New Testament, it denotes

an answer or defence given in response to an accusation, such as Paul addressing a hostile crowd in Jerusalem (Acts 22:1). The appellation ‘Christian’ (*Christianos*) is only established around time of Ignatius (early C2nd C.E.) and it is a Latinism transliterated into Greek. This would suggest it was coined by Roman officials in their dealings with them, specifically in trials and legal actions against them.

Writing about the emergent Christian literature of the second and third centuries, commonly known as ‘the Apologies’, Helen Ree notes that such writings comprised the ‘self-definition and self-representation’ of early Christianity, in response both to the external pressures of pagan hostility and the internal challenges of heterodoxy and disunity (Ree, 2005, p. 1). From the very beginning, then, the task of apologetics has been one of defending and commending its claims against a variety of non-believers, detractors and persecutors: Jews, pagans, sceptics and Emperors.

Whilst ‘apologist’ may be of modern provenance, Oscar Skarsaune (2010) argues that this tradition is pioneered by Justin Martyr’s first and second *Apology*, dating from the mid-C2nd, and effectively comes to an end with Tertullian. The actual term ‘apology’ appears to have originated with the early C4th writer Eusebius of Caesarea, to denote works addressed to the Roman Emperor. By this definition, that means Tertullian, Athenagoras, Quadratus, Aristedes and Justin, all from this period, qualify as ‘apologists’ or writers of apologies that were not addressed to fellow Christians (such as 1 Peter) or simply to peers, such as philosophers or pagan believers, but were directed at the public authorities. These were justifications for the Christian faith that reached beyond the Church itself to the wider society – indeed, to the highest Imperial powers of all.

The opening paragraph of Justin Martyr's (c100-167 CE) first Apology illustrates this well. The imperial leadership are addressed as men of learning, certainly; but in appealing to them in concert with other civil powers, and in introducing his own patrimony and citizenship as a representative of all the 'nations' who suffer persecution, Justin cements together the political and philosophical dimensions of his defence.

'To the Emperor Titus Aelius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar, and to his son Verissimus the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher, the natural son of Caesar, and the adopted son of Pius, a lover of learning, and to the sacred senate, with the whole people of the Romans, I, Justin, son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neopolis in Palestine, present this address and petition in [sic] behalf of those of all nations who are unjustly hated and wantonly abused, myself being one of them.' (Justin Martyr, 1983, p. 5)

Similarly, the apology of Athenagorus the Athenian (C2nd) reminds the Emperor of the highest principles of freedom of religion, enquiring why Christians appear to be excluded from this honourable treatment. He defends his faith on philosophical and intellectual grounds; but his chief motivation is to counter the slander and misrepresentation of Christianity. All he asks, says Athenagorus, is to be treated just like any other Imperial subject:

'To the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, conquerors of Armenia and Sarmatia, and more than all, philosophers ...

In your empire, greatest of sovereigns, different nations have different customs and laws; and no one is hindered by law or fear of punishment from following his ancestral usages, however ridiculous these may be ...

But for us who are called Christians you have not in like manner cared; but although we commit no wrong – nay, as will appear in the sequel to this discourse, are of all men most piously and righteously disposed towards the Deity and towards your government – you allow us to be harassed, plundered, and persecuted, the multitude making war upon us for our name alone ...

If, indeed, anyone can convict us of a crime, be it small or great, we do not ask to be excused from punishment, but are prepared to undergo the sharpest and most merciless inflictions. But if the accusation relates merely to our name ... it will devolve on you, illustrious and benevolent and most-learned sovereigns, to remove by law this most despiteful treatment, so that, as throughout the world both individuals and citizens partake of your beneficence, we also may feel grateful to you, exulting that we are no longer the victims of false accusation ...' (Athenagoras, 1983, pp. 35-37)

The apologists of this era may be said to be stating a number of important principles, therefore. Firstly, they uphold the credibility of Christian faith by means of appeals to non-Christian sources. Secondly, they turn to ideals of natural justice in their petitions regarding the way in which Imperial power is exercised (Skarsaune, 2010, pp. 125-129). Thirdly, whilst these apologists are certainly concerned to defend the intellectual coherence and Scriptural provenance of such witness, their arguments are also directed towards offering a theologically-reasoned rationale for the legitimacy of faith to 'speak truth to power' and pursue a public vocation of active citizenship. Such apologies were effectively a 'petition' to the Emperor (Skarsaune, 2010, p. 123).

What is more, they affirm the dialogical and 'bilingual' nature of apologetics, in terms of the need to adopt the thought-forms and vernacular of one's interlocutors. This helps us elaborate

Stackhouse's conjunction of public theology and apologetics, since this is about justifying the moral and civic probity of communities of Christians to imperial and intellectual publics alike.

Since the eighteenth century, however, Christian apologetics has come to mean 'the scholarly reflection on Christian apologetic witness and dialogue as the intellectual justification of the truth and relevance of the Christian faith.' (van den Toren 2011, p. 27) It is strongly associated with evangelical parts of the Church which would insist on apologetics as entailing persuasion, a call to faith and personal evangelism. Whilst many contemporary apologists would acknowledge that Christian faith comprises more than intellectual assent to theological propositions (Beilby 2011, pp. 168–9), the emphasis on the rational plausibility of Christian doctrine has led to an emphasis on rationalist, scientific and propositional proof-arguments, at the expense of more incarnational, sacramental understandings of truth.

In recent years, however, there has been a shift away from a reliance on pure reason towards an apologetics that aims to engage with non-theological, cultural forms in order to find spaces of shared meaning – with motifs such as narrative, imagination and performativity taking the place of rationalist, propositional methods.

As Benno van den Toren argues for example, apologetics cannot be judged by universal, abstract criteria of correspondence to idealist truth. It requires attention to the cultural and philosophical context in which all participants in the conversation are immersed. Such an understanding of apologetics roots it firmly in its context and in the immediacy of experience and narrative. A recent collection of essays, entitled *Imaginative Apologetics*, argues, similarly that it is through the media of culture, literature, art and science that Christians should be defending and justifying

their faith. This also opens up the possibility of apologetics as mediated through performative and aesthetic means. Apologetics is presented as kind of contextual theology, entailing a reading of the signs of the times as revealed through popular culture, the arts and humanities:

‘It is not possible to discover how the Christian faith, and the Church, can speak meaningfully into a secular world unless efforts have first been made to understand the shape of this world itself: its values, assumptions, prejudices, cravings; especially as these reveal where the veil is thinnest between secular and religious concerns, and where, in fact, the Spirit may be going before those who already belong to faith, made manifest in places beyond the confines of the institutional Church.’ (Lazenby, 2011, p. 46)

This, of course, is quite consistent with the sensibilities of the earliest evangelists for the Gospel, who knew well the importance of addressing their audiences on their own terms, using concepts and arguments that would connect directly with their concerns, in terms familiar to their indigenous world-view. According to this model, then, apologetics is not interested in propositional truth (although any representation of faith will need to be intellectually robust) so much as something that excites our imagination. By the same token, an engagement with public life, literature, the arts and material cultures constitutes a significant arena for apologetics, since these are the places where questions of truth, beauty, goodness are encountered; they are “diagnostic spaces”: places here the relationship between religion and the wider world is being clearly played out’ (Lazenby 2011).

An 'Apologetics of Presence'

The problem is that none of the essays in *Imaginative Apologetics* contains a reference to anything resembling public theology, defined as Christian engagement in and commentary upon matters such as economics, civil society, media or politics. Yet if we were to transpose its core thesis into public theology, it might entail a demonstration of the difference faith makes to citizenship and public values, or offering an explanation to other citizens of the reasoning behind a particular public stance. So the invitation is not to 'believe' but to enter or embrace a world-view which 'unless it is also shown in action it is not adequately shown at all' (Davison 2011, p. 26). These form the basis of the 'reckoning' (2011, p. 14) offered to the rest of the world, in terms of *the difference it makes* to inhabit such a world-view.

Such an 'apologetics of presence' (Murphy-O'Connor, 2009) embodies a number of motifs. After Duncan Forrester, I locate public theology as concerned primarily with 'the welfare of the city' (Jer. 29.7), responding to the agenda of the world and contributing critically and constructively (in word and action) to a flourishing public square (Forrester, 2004). This is consistent with the bilingual and dialogical nature of public theology, in that it should seek to be accountable to a broader reality which transcends any single institutional self-interest. Indeed, one of the ways in which public theology might promote the welfare of the city is to help to build a civil, inclusive space of public debate and action in which everyone is encouraged to cultivate the skills of active citizenship, whatever their background.

Secondly, post-secular public theology must maintain its vocation to 'speak truth to power', in continuity with the first Christian apologists who addressed political rulers in their defences of

faith. Yet such an apologetic does not simply uphold the privileges of the Church, but challenges and prescribes in the interests of our common humanity. The historic understanding of early Christian apologists as petitioners to the Imperial powers, calling for justice and civil freedoms should remain an important memory in this respect. But to speak ‘truth to power’ in our day also invites consideration of the prophetic dimensions of public theology, and I will suggest that this requires the adoption of a stance of advocacy with the poor and marginalized, what Gustavo Gutiérrez terms the ‘non-persons’ of history (Gutiérrez, 1983). He contrasts this with the Church’s mission to the ‘non-believer’, which resonates with my insistence on reclaiming apologetics as more than a merely cognitive or propositional activity. Christian apologetics is in part a demonstration of ‘God’s preferential option for the poor’: of providing the theological justification for the practices of solidarity with those who find themselves on the underside of history.

But there is a challenge for the Church itself. Arguably, public theology is most decisively enacted and made convincing through the grass-roots witness of local communities, as bearers of transformative social capital and as ‘Ambassadors for Christ’ (2 Cor. 5.20). But are ordinary, lay Christians really given the resources to relate the teachings of Scripture and tradition to the dilemmas of everyday life, let alone to be equipped as effective ‘apologists’ I wonder? It’s possible that traditions of public theology that have concentrated on the statements of church leaders need to be augmented by a more sustained approach to fostering the role of the laity, and nurturing grass-roots practices of discipleship that spill over into active citizenship. This impinges on aspects of Christian formation and catechesis as well, since it also makes a priority of the cultivation of the skills of theological literacy amongst the laity, not least in order to maintain the reservoir of theological reflection on which effective apologetics depends.

Conclusion

I've been arguing that some of the most significant and foundational events and texts of early Christianity were apologetic in nature. But they were often also quintessentially pieces of public theology: not only were they conducted in public assemblies, religious or civic, subjecting themselves to universal scrutiny, but they were also often petitions directed at the political authorities, and concerned the relationship of Christians to imperial and secular authority as well as matters of belief. It is my belief that it now falls to public theology to take on a similar apologetic role, of rendering Christian faith comprehensible in a world in which religion is both simultaneously increasingly at odds with cultural trends and yet at the same time newly, and vividly relevant. Max Stackhouse's advocacy of the necessity of public theology marks the beginning of an apologetic justification that equips Church leaders and lay people alike to articulate the values that underpin a thriving global civil society (Hainsworth and Paeth, 2010, pp. xii-xiv). Public theology 'must show that it can form, inform and sustain the moral and spiritual architecture of a civil society so that truth, justice and mercy are more nearly approximated in the souls of persons and in the institutions of the common life.' (Stackhouse, 2007, p. 107)

Public theology is not only concerned to do theology *about* public issues, but called to do its theology *in* public, by demonstrating a transparency and accountability towards a thriving, plural public realm that transcends special pleading or sectional interest in the name of the common good. The challenge is to demonstrate how and why the Gospel demands of love, justice, forgiveness and hope are compelling imperatives to be realised 'on earth as it is in heaven'.

References

- Athenagoras. (1983). A Plea for the Christians. In L. R. Bush (Ed.), *Classical Readings in Christian Apologetics AD 100-1800* (pp. 35-61). Grand Rapids, Mn: Academie Books.
- Baker, C. R. and Beaumont, J. (eds) (2010). *Postsecular Cities: Space, Theory and Practice*. London : Continuum.
- Beilby, J. K. (2011). *Thinking about Christian Apologetics*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Blair, T. (2014). Religious difference, not ideology, will fuel this century's epic battles. The Observer January 26 (online),
<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/25/religious-difference-ideology-conflicts-middle-east-tony-blair> [February 21, 2014]
- Breitenberg, H. J. (2010). What is Public Theology? In D.K. Hainsworth and S.R. Paeth, eds. *Public Theology for a Global Society* (pp. 3-17). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm B. Eerdmans.
- Bretherton, L. (2010). *Christianity and Contemporary Politics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Casanova, J. (1994). *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chase, K. (2001, March 16). *Publics, Apologetics, and Ethics: An Interview with Max L. Stackhouse* . Retrieved June 4, 2012, from
<http://faithsphilosophy.org/Documents/publicsapologeticsethics.pdf>
- ComRes. (2013). *The Spirit of Things Unseen Spirituality Survey*. London: Theos.
- Davison, A. (. (2011). *Imaginative Apologetics: Theology, Philosophy and the Catholic Tradition*. London: SCM Press.
- de Gruchy, J. W. (2007). 'Public Theology as Christian Witness: Exploring the Genre. *International Journal of Public Theology*, 1(1), 26-41.

- de Villiers, E. (2011). Public Theology in the South African Context. *International Journal of Public Theology* , 5(1), 5-22.
- Dillon, M. (2010). Can Post-Secular Society Tolerate Religious Differences? *Sociology of Religion* , 71.2, 139-156.
- Dulles, A. (1999). *A History of Apologetics* (First published 1971). Eugene, ON: Wipf and Stock.
- Eagleton, T. (2014). *Culture and the Death of God*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Forrester, D. B. (2004). The Scope of Public Theology. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 17(2), 5-19.
- Gorski, P. K., Kim, D.K., Torpey, J. and VanAntwerpen, J. (eds) (2012). *The Post-Secular in Question: Religion in Contemporary Society*. New York: New York University Press.
- Graham, E. (2013). *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Public Theology in a Post-Secular Age*. London: SCM Press.
- Graham, E. and Lowe, S.R. (2009). *What Makes a Good City? Public Theology and the Urban Church*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Gutiérrez, G. (1983). *The Power of the Poor in History*. London: SCM Press.
- Habermas, J. (2008, June 18). Notes on a Post-Secular Society. *Sign and Sight* . . . Retrieved October 15, 2012, from www.signandsight.com/features/1714.html
- Habermas, J. (2010). An Awareness of what is Missing. In J. Habermas (ed.), *An Awareness of what is Missing: Faith and Reason in a Post-Secular Age* (pp. 15-23). Cambridge: Polity.
- Hainsworth, D.K. and Paeth, S.R. (2010). Introduction. In D.K. Hainsworth and S.R. Paeth (eds.), *Public Theology for a Global Society* (pp. viii-xx). Grand Rapids, MN: Wm B Eerdmans.
- Harrington, A. (2007). Habermas and the "Post-Secular Society". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(4), 543-560.
- Heyer, K. E. (2004). How Does Theology Go Public? Rethinking the Debate between David Tracy and George Lindbeck. *Political Theology*, 5.3, 307-327.
- Hogue, M. (2010). After the Secular: Toward a Pragmatic Public Theology. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 78(2), 346-374.

- Lazenby, D. (2011). Apologetics, Literature and Worldview. In A. Davison (Ed.), *Imaginative Apologetics: Theology, Philosophy and the Catholic Tradition* (pp. 46-58). London: SCM Press.
- Martyr, J. (1983). The First Apology of Justin. In L. R. Bush (Ed.), *Classical Readings in Christian Apologetics A.D. 100-1800* (pp. 5-29). Grand Rapids, MN: Zondervan.
- Murphy-O'Connor, C. (2009, February 27). *Gaudium et Spes - The Shape of the Church: Past, Present and to Come ...* Retrieved January 19, 2013, from Thinking Faith: www.thinkingfaith.org
- Paeth, S. R. (2014). Introduction. In S. R. Paeth, E.H. Breitenberg, Jr. and H.J. Lee (Eds.), *Shaping Public Theology: Selections from the Writings of Max L. Stackhouse* (pp. xi-xxxiii). Grand Rapids, Mn: Wm B Eerdmans.
- Ree, H. (2005). *Early Christian Literature: Christ and Culture in the Second and Third Centuries*. London: Routledge.
- Skarsaune, O. (2010). Justin and the Apologists. In D. J. Bingham (Ed.), *Routledge Companion to Early Christian Thought* (pp. 121-136). London: Routledge.
- Stackhouse, M. (2006). Public Theology and Ethical Judgement. *Theology Today*, 54(2), 165-191.
- Stackhouse, M. (2007). *God and Globalization, Volume 4: Globalization and Grace*. New York: Continuum.
- Stackhouse, M. L. (2014). The Pastor as Public Theologian. In S.K. Paeth, E.H. Breitenberg, Jr. and H.J. Lee (Eds.), *Shaping Public Theology: Selections from the Writings of Max L. Stackhouse* (pp. 286-302). Grand Rapids, Mn: Wm B. Eerdmans.
- Storrar, W. R. (2004). *Public Theology for the 21st Century*. London: T&T Clark.
- Stroup, G., 1984. *The Nature of Doctrine*. London: SCM Press.
- Taylor, C. (2007). *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press.
- van den Toren, B. (2011). *Christian Apologetics as Cross-Cultural Dialogue*. London: Continuum.

Werpehowski, W. (1986). Ad Hoc Apologetics. *Journal of Religion*, 66(3), 282-301.

Woodhead, L. (2012). Introduction. In L. Woodhead and R. Catto (Eds.), *Religion and Change in Modern Britain* (pp. 1-33). London: Routledge.